```
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
                     IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11
   CARL SCHMID,
12
                        Plaintiff,
                                             2:03-cv-0774-GEB-PAN (JFM)
13
                                             ORDER DISMISSING ACTION
              V.
14
   COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN; BAXTER
15
   DUNN; GREGORY BETTI; N. BRAND;
   TOM SWEESO; JERRY HERZICK; BILL
16
   HUGHES; K. WARD; and SARGENT
   SKAFF,
17
                        Defendants.
18
19
              The "Stipulation for Settlement and Judgment" filed
   April 25, 2006, ("Settlement") reflects the settlement of this action.
20
21
   "The settlement is just another contract to be enforced in the usual
22
   way, that is, by a fresh suit[,]" unless the federal court exercises
23
   jurisdiction over it as is requested in the Settlement. 1 Jessup v.
   Luther, 277 F.3d 926, 929 (7th Cir. 2002).
24
25
26
             "Of course, the mere fact that the parties agree that the
27
   [federal] court should exercise . . . jurisdiction [over their
   Settlement Agreement] is not binding on the court." Arata v. Nu Skin
28
```

Int'l, Inc., 96 F.3d 1265, 1269 (9th Cir. 1996).

Case 2:03-cv-00774-GEB-PAN Document 24 Filed 04/28/06 Page 2 of 2

While it is recognized that federal jurisdiction can be exercised over certain settlements, exercising jurisdiction is not automatic. Rather, a settlement must be analyzed for determination whether the exercise of jurisdiction over it is "essential to the conduct of federal-court business." Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins.

Co. of Am., 511 U.S. 375, 382 (1994). The Settlement has transformed the settled action into California State agreements concerning monetary, environmental and aesthetic matters. Since the monitoring and/or adjudication of these settled matters is not "essential to the conduct of federal-court business[,]" jurisdiction will not be exercised over the Settlement. Since this action is settled, this action is dismissed. See Oswalt v. Scripto, Inc., 616 F.2d 191, 194 (5th Cir. 1980) (revealing that when a settlement is tantamount to a stipulated dismissal, a dismissal order should issue). The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 28, 2006

/s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr. GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR. United States District Judge